arXiv:1704.02450v1 [cs.CV] 8 Apr 2017

Coupled Deep Learning for Heterogeneous Face Recognition

Xiang Wu, Lingxiao Song, Ran He, Tieniu Tan
Center for Research on Intelligent Perception and Computing (CRIPAC),
National Laboratory of Pattern Recognition (NLPR),
Institute of Automation, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, P. R. China, 100190
alfredxiangwu@gmail.com, {lingxiao.song, rhe, tnt}@nlpr.ia.ac.cn

Abstract

Heterogeneous face matching is a challenge issue in face recognition due to large domain difference as well as insufficient pairwise images in different modalities during training. This paper proposes a coupled deep learning (CDL) approach for the heterogeneous face matching. CDL seeks a shared feature space in which the heterogeneous face matching problem can be approximately treated as a homogeneous face matching problem. The objective function of CDL mainly includes two parts. The first part contains a trace norm as a relevance constraint, which makes unpaired images from multiple modalities be clustered and correlated. An approximate variational formulation is introduced to deal with the difficulties of optimizing low-rank constraint directly. The second part contains a cross modal ranking among triplet domain specific images to maximize the margin for different identities and increase data for a small amount of training samples. Besides, an alternating minimization method is employed to iteratively update the parameters of CDL. Experimental results show that CDL achieves better performance on the challenging CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 face recognition database, the IIIT-D Sketch database, the CUHK Face Sketch (CUFS), and the CUHK Face Sketch FERET (CUFSF), which significantly outperforms state-of-the-art heterogeneous face recognition methods.

1. Introduction

The performance of real-world face recognition systems suffers a lot from illumination variations, which is a traditional challenge in face recognition. The technique of near infrared (NIR) imaging provides a low-cost and effective solution to acquire high-quality images in conditions of low light or complete darkness, for which NIR imaging is widely adopted in video surveillance and user authentication applications. However, many applications require that the enrollment of face templates is based on visual (VIS) images, such as online registration and pre-enrollment using passport or ID card. Therefore, face matching between NIR and VIS images has drawn much attention in recent decades.



Figure 1. Two-dimensional nonlinear embedding of NIR and VIS face images by coupled deep learning. Although there are large margins between different subjects, the face images of one subject are still divided into two related groups due to the appearance gap between NIR and VIS images. The low-rank relevance and cross-modal ranking are used to alleviate the semantic gap and a small number of training samples.

One major challenge in matching faces from VIS-NIR heterogeneous conditions is that images of the same subject may differ in appearance due to the changes between VIS images and NIR images. This difference introduces high intra-class variations (as shown in Fig. 1), which generally make a direct comparison between samples have poor matching accuracy. Some research efforts have been devoted to addressing this challenge [14, 16, 22, 34], and mainly focus on transforming data from different modalities onto a common comparable space. Since the changes of face appearance are often influenced by many factors (e.g. identities, illuminations and expressions) and noise information in different modalities show diverse distributions, reducing the intra-class variations of heterogeneous face data is more complex than that of homogeneous face data.

Besides, benefitting from the prosperity of social networks, large-scale VIS face data are easily obtained from the Internet, which is exactly a key factor of the success of deep learning based VIS face recognition systems [24]. As the scale of training data dramatically increases, deep learning networks become deeper and larger, resulting in a larger parameter space. However, it is hard and expensive to collect corresponding heterogeneous NIR image data. A small scale of pairwise VIS-NIR limits the application of deep learning methods to the VIS-NIR matching problem. Consequently, how to utilize these massive unpaired VIS data effectively to boost the research of heterogeneous face recognition is still an ongoing issue.

Motivated by these observations, this paper proposes a deep learning framework, named coupled deep learning (CDL), to address the VIS-NIR heterogeneous matching problem. It transfers the deep representation learnt on a large-scale VIS dataset [30] to adapt to NIR domain by introducing a novel VIS-NIR objective function for convolution neural networks. It seeks a deep feature space in which the heterogeneous face matching problem can be approximately treated as a homogeneous face matching problem. Inspired by the relevance constraints in cross-modal learning [26], we introduce a trace norm to the softmax loss of convolutional neural networks. This low-rank relevance loss can enhance the relevance of projection matrices of NIR and VIS images so that the difference between modalities is reduced and identity information is reserved, especially for the small number of training samples. On the account of making use of the massive VIS face images, a cross modal ranking loss defined on a set of NIR-VIS triplets is introduced. Based on the alternative formulation for the trace norm, an iterative solution is developed and combined it into the convolutional neural network. Due to the limited pairwise VIS-NIR images, the parameters of shallow network layers are shared among different modalities. Experimental results on several heterogeneous face databases verify the effectiveness of each part in the CDL loss function.

The main contributions are summarized as follows:

- A novel trace norm on fully connected layer, as a regularizer, is used not only to enforce the relevance between different modalities, but also to constrain the parameter space, which can alleviate overfitting especially on a small amount of unpaired heterogenous samples.
- Due to the difficulty to directly optimize the high-order trace norm, we introduce an approximate variational formulation of the trace norm and present an alternating algorithm to efficiently optimize it in an end-to-end CNN.
- A cross-modal ranking sampling method defined on a set of cross-modal triplets is applied to maximize the margin between different subjects. Besides, it is effective to enlarge the training data and to utilize the information between a limited number of heterogenous samples.
- Extensive experimental evaluations on the challenging CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 face database and three viewed sketch-photo databases show that the proposed method improves the state-of-the-art performance on heterogeneous face recognition.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we overview related work on the heterogeneous face recognition problem. Section 3 describes our proposed coupled deep learning framework for heterogeneous face recognition. In Section 4, we report experimental results on the different heterogeneous face recognition datasets. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 5.

2. Related Work

2.1. Heterogeneous Face Recognition

The task of heterogeneous face recognition is to match face images that come from different modalities, such as visual versus near infrared (VIS-NIR) face recognition [33, 34], visual versus thermal infrared face recognition [22, 23], face photo versus face sketch [25, 28]. According to the way to alleviate the appearance difference between heterogeneous data, existing heterogeneous face recognition methods can be roughly divided into three categories [37]: (i) data synthesis based; (ii) latent subspace learning based; (iii) modal-invariant feature learning based methods.

Data synthesis based methods aim to project the data of one modality into the space of another modality by data synthesis. Thus the similarity relationship of heterogeneous data from different domain can be measured. Liu et al. [17] propose a local geometry preserving based nonlinear method to generate pseudo-sketch from face photo. Wang *et al.* [28] present a cross-spectrum face mapping method to transform NIR and VIS data to another type, and thereby perform face matching. Wang and Tang [28] use a multi-scale Markov Random Fields (MRF) model to synthesize sketch drawing from given face photo and vice versa. Lei *et al.* [13] propose a canonical correlation analysis (CCA) based multi-variant mapping algorithm to reconstruct 3D model from a single 2D NIR image.

Latent subspace learning based approaches project both modalities to a common latent space, in which the relevance of data from different modalities can be measured. Dimension reduction techniques such as Principal Component Analysis (PCA), Canonical Correlation Analysis (CCA) and Partial Least Squares (PLS) are often used. Lin and Tang [16] propose a method called Common Discriminant Feature Extraction (CDFE) method transform data to a common feature space. CDFE takes both inter-

modality discriminant information and intra-modality local consistency into consideration. Hou *et al.* [8] propose a domain adaptive self-taught learning approach to derive a common subspace. Yi *et al.* [32] suggests to use Restricted Boltzmann Machines (RBMs) to learn a shared representation between different modalities, and then apply PCA to remove the redundancy and heterogeneity. The state-of-the-art NIR-VIS result on the CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 face database is now obtained by [32].

Modality-invariant feature learning based methods seek modality-invariant features that are only related to face identity. Existing algorithms in this category are almost based on handcrafted local features, such as local binary patterns (LBP), Histograms of Oriented Gradients (HOG) and Difference of Gaussian (DoG). Liao *et al.* [15] use DoG filtering as preprocessing for illumination normalization, and then employ Multi-block LBP (MB-LBP) to encode NIR as well as VIS images. Klare *et al.* [12] further combine HoG features to LBP descriptors, and utilize sparse representation to improve recognition accuracy. HoG feature and its variants are applied to NIR-VIS face matching in [2]. Goswami *et al.* [3] incorporate a series of preprocessing methods to perform normalization, then combine a Local Binary Pattern Histogram (LBPH) representation with LDA to extract invariant features. However, most of above features are designed empirically. Zhu *et al.* [37] involve Log-DoG filtering, local encoding and uniform feature normalization together to reduce the appearance difference between VIS and NIR images.

Although some heterogeneous face recognition algorithms have obtained good results, the performance of heterogeneous face matching tasks is still far below than that of VIS face matching, which benefits fully from the development of deep learning models. In the last decades, numerous deep learning based face recognition algorithms have been proposed [18, 21, 20, 29, 30], and many of them have more than 98% verification accuracy on the challenging LFW database. However, there are few deep learning methods for heterogeneous face recognition due to the lack of training samples.

2.2. Cross-view Classification

Multi-view learning involves relating information from multiple sources or views. Ngiam *et al.* [19] considered a shared representation learning setting from multiple modalities with RBM. Wang *et al.* [27] proposed several DNN-based methods with linear or kernel CCA in unsupervised multi-view feature learning. However, the second view is used as the prior and is not available at test time. Yan [31] address the problem of matching images and captions with deep canonical correlation analysis. They employ convolution networks to obtain representations and then seek pairs of linear projections by maximizing the correlation of the two views according to CCA. Kan [11] also attempts to seek for a discriminant and view-invariant representation by analyzing the within-class and between-class scatter. Besides, Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) [5] is widely used to learn domain-invariant representations by minimizing the domain discrepancy, but it only considers the first momnent (mean) of the multiple modal distributions. Central Moment Discrepancy [35] introduce high-order moments as a metric in the field of domain-invariant representation learning.

Since the existing cross-view methods are unsupervised deep non-linear methods or generic cross-view classification methods. While heterogenous face recognition is zero-shot learning which the identities in testing dataset is exclusive from the identities in training dataset and it is also treated as fine-grained classification because samples are similar even in different modalities. Due to these properties, generic or unsupervised cross-view methods cannot find a generalized embedding space to sperate each identity from different modalities. Exploring an explicit cross-modal methods for heterogeneous face matching problem via deep learning deserves to be further studied.

3. Method

In this section, we first introduce the two major parts in the CDL objective function, and then we detail the whole network architecture of CDL.

3.1. Relevance Constraint

In VIS-NIR face recognition, the projection matrices are often learnt by subspace learning methods. Particularly, PCA is used as a post-processing step to improve matching accuracy. Inspired by these observations, we introduce a relevance constraint to the softmax loss of CNN.

Given I_V and I_N for VIS and NIR images respectively, we can denote the CNN feature extraction process as $X_i = \mathrm{Conv}(\mathrm{I}_i, \Theta_i), i \in \{N, V\}$, where Conv() is defined by the convolution neural network, Θ_i denotes the CNN parameters and $X_i \in \mathrm{R}^m$ is the feature representation. In heterogeneous face recognition, we assume that there are some common low-level features between NIR and VIS images. Hence, it is $\Theta_N = \Theta_V = \Theta$ and the representation can be shown as $X_i = \mathrm{Conv}(\mathrm{I}_i, \Theta)$.

As the softmax loss is widely used as the supervised signal for CNN, we can define a generic loss function in the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(X_i, W_i) &= \sum_{i \in \{N,V\}} \mathrm{softmax}(X_i, W_i) \\ &= -\sum_{i \in \{N,V\}} (\sum_{j=1}^{N} 1\{y_{ij} = c\} \log \hat{p}_{ij}) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $W_i, i \in \{N, V\}$ is the parameters for NIR and VIS samples, respectively, c is the class label for each sample and $\hat{p}_{ij}$ is the predicted probability. Besides, we define $1\{\cdot\}$ is the indicator function so that $1\{\text{a true statement}\} = 1$ and $1\{\text{a false statement}\} = 0$.

Since the core of cross-modal matching is searching the common feature space to reserve the discriminative information, we impose a relevance constraint to the softmax loss

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}}(X_i, W_i) = &\sum_{i \in N,V} \text{softmax}(X_i, W_i) \\ &+ \lambda \| \left[W_N \;\; W_V \right] \|_*\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\|\mathrm{M}\|_*$ is the trace norm, which is used to enforce the relevance of the projected common label space. The trace norm in Eq. (2) can also reduce the parameter space of CNN for a small-scale dataset.

Eq. (2) is difficult to directly optimize for the presence of the trace norm. Here, we introduce an iterative minimization solution for the trace norm[4] based on its variational formulation.

Lemma 1. *Let* $\mathrm{M} \in \mathrm{R}^{m \times n}$. *The trace norm of* M *is shown as:*

$$\|\mathrm{M}\|_* = \sum_{i=1}^{\min(m,n)} \sigma_i \tag{3}$$

where σ_i *denotes the* i*-th singular value of* M. *The formulation can be equal to:*

$$\|\mathrm{M}\|_* = \frac{1}{2} \inf_{\Gamma \geq 0} \text{tr}(\mathrm{M}^T \Gamma^{-1} \mathrm{M}) + \text{tr}(\Gamma) \tag{4}$$

and the semi-definite matrix Γ *is attained for* $\Gamma = (\mathrm{M}\mathrm{M}^T)^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

According to this lemma, Eq. (2) can be reformulate as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}}(X_i, W_i, \Gamma) = &\sum_{i \in N,V} \text{softmax}(X_i, W_i) \\ + \frac{1}{2}\lambda \text{tr}(&\left[W_N \;\; W_V \right]^T \Gamma^{-1} \left[W_N \;\; W_V \right]) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda \text{tr}(\Gamma)\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

In terms of the trace properties, the second term in Eq. (5) can be represented as:

$$\begin{aligned}&\text{tr}(\left[W_N \;\; W_V \right]^T \Gamma^{-1} \left[W_N \;\; W_V \right]) \\ &= \text{tr}(W_N^T \Gamma^{-1} W_N) + \text{tr}(W_V^T \Gamma^{-1} W_V)\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

and according to [4], the infimum over Γ can be computed as

$$\Gamma = (W_N W_N^T + W_V W_V^T + \mu \mathrm{I})^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{7}$$

To minimize Eq. (5) in CNN, we develop an alternating minimization method by updating the parameters Θ, W_i and Γ. For the convolution parameter Θ, we follow the conventional back-propagation method to update it. For the matrix Γ, we can update it via Eq. (7). For the projected matrix W_V and W_N, the gradients contain two components which can be expressed as

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}}}{\partial W_N} = \frac{\partial \text{softmax}(X_i, W_N)}{\partial W_N} + W_N(\Gamma^{-1} + (\Gamma^{-1})^T) \tag{8}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}}}{\partial W_V} = \frac{\partial \text{softmax}(X_i, W_V)}{\partial W_V} + W_V(\Gamma^{-1} + (\Gamma^{-1})^T) \tag{9}$$

To obtain Γ^{-1} for updating W_N and W_V, we can compute $U\text{Diag}(\gamma_k)V^T$ by the singular value decomposition of $W_N W_N^T + W_V W_V^T$. Hence, the inverse of matrix Γ takes the following form

$$\Gamma^{-1} = V\text{Diag}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{(\gamma_k + \mu)}})U^T \tag{10}$$

Then the parameters can be updated with the learning rate α as follows.

$$\Theta^{(t+1)} = \Theta^{(t)} - \alpha \frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}}}{\partial \Theta^{(t)}} \tag{11}$$

$$W_N^{(t+1)} = W_N^{(t)} - \alpha \frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}}}{\partial W_N^{(t)}} \tag{12}$$

$$W_V^{(t+1)} = W_V^{(t)} - \alpha \frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}}}{\partial W_V^{(t)}} \tag{13}$$

3.2. Cross Modal Ranking

Considering the cross modal matching between NIR and VIS face images, encouraged by [21], we formulate a cross modal ranking term to preserve the intra-personal similarity in different domains. When the cross modal triplet ranking regularization is employed, both NIR and VIS face images of one identity are potentially encouraged to be projected onto the same point in the modal invariant embedding subspace.

Moreover, the deep convolution neural network usually requires a large amount of training data, however, there are not enough labeled NIR and VIS images for training by the softmax loss. The cross modal triplet ranking can enlarge the number of training data.

Given $x_i \in X = \{X_N, X_V\}$, where $x_{N_i} \in X_N$ and $x_{V_i} \in X_V$ for NIR and VIS features respectively, we can sample a set of triplet tuples depending on the labels $T_i = (x_i^a, x_i^p, x_i^n)$, where x_i^a and x_i^p are images of the same label, while x_i^p and x_i^n are with different labels. For a triplet tuple, the ranking loss is defined as

$$\mathcal{J}_{\text{ranking}} = \sum_{i=0}^{N} \max(0, m + \|x_i^a - x_i^p\|^2 - \|x_i^a - x_i^n\|^2) \tag{14}$$

where the constant parameter m defines a margin between positive and negative pairs.

It is crucial to select the triplets, which are active and can contribute to improve model performance. Since the triplet ranking is used to reduce the gap between different modalities, random selection of triplet tuples is not applicable. Therefore, we propose a strategy for cross modal triplets selection. The anchor sample x_i^a and the negative one x_i^n is selected from the same modality and the modality of positive sample x_i^p is different from anchor and negative ones. For exmaple, if the anchor sample is selected from near infrared set X_N, the positive one is from the visible light set X_V and the negative one is from X_N.

Moreover, a hard triplet tuple may be caused by mislabeling or poor image quality, so it might lead to poor training. On contrast, a simple triplet is easy to satisfy the triplet constraint in Eq. (14) and less contributes to the training so that the network converges slowly. Therefore, the semi-hard triplet selection method is adopted to further improve the cross modal matching performance.

From the above, the cross modal triplet selection is based on the constraints as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \|x_i^a - x_i^p\|^2 + m > \|x_i^a - x_i^n\|^2 \\ \|x_i^a - x_i^p\|^2 < \|x_i^a - x_i^n\|^2 \\ x_i^a, x_i^n \in X_N(X_V), \;\; x_i^p \in X_V(X_N) \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

where the constant parameter m is the margin in Eq. (14). Under these constraints shown in Eq. (15), the network focuses more attention on the individual distinction to eliminate cross modal variance.

3.3. Network Architecture

We employ the light CNN [30] as our basic network. The network includes nine convolution layers, four max-pooling layers and one fully-connected layer. Softmax is used as the loss function. To address the small-scale data for NIR-VIS training, we firstly train a CNN on the large visible light face dataset and then fine-tune the NIR-VIS one on the pre-trained visible light face model. The basic VIS network and initial values of Θ are trained on the MS-Celeb-1M dataset[6] which contains 100K identities totally about 8.5M images.

Based on the basic network, we develop a coupled deep learning (**CDL**) framework for NIR-VIS face recognition. We combine the softmax term with relevance constraint and cross modal ranking term as the supervised signal:

$$\mathcal{J} = \lambda_1 \mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{J}_{\text{ranking}} \tag{16}$$

where λ_1, λ_2 is the trade-off between two loss terms. The softmax with relevance constraint term aims to enforce the correlation across different modalities for each identity. And the cross modal ranking can not only enforce the intrinsic properties of the same identities from different domain, but also enlarge the inter-personal similarity in the same domain. The gradients of all the parameters can be computed by

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{J}}{\partial \Theta} = \lambda_1 \frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}}}{\partial \Theta} + \lambda_2 \frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_{\text{ranking}}}{\partial \Theta} \tag{17}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{J}}{\partial W_N} = \lambda_1 \frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}}}{\partial W_N} \tag{18}$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{J}}{\partial W_V} = \lambda_1 \frac{\partial \mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}}}{\partial W_V} \tag{19}$$

According to Eq. (16), the goal of CDL is to learn the parameters Θ for feature extraction, while W_N, W_V and Γ are only parameters introduced to propagate signals during training. All the parameters are updated by stochastic gradient descent and an alternating minimization method is proposed to update W_N, W_V and Γ. The details of CDL training is shown in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Coupled Deep Learning (CDL) Training.

Input: Training set: NIR images I_N, VIS images I_V, the learning rate α, the ranking threshold m and the trade-off parameters $\lambda, \lambda_1, \lambda_2$.

Output: The CNN parameters Θ.

Initialize parameters Θ, W_N, W_V by pre-trained VIS model;
for $t = 1, \ldots, T$ **do**
  Forward propagation to obtain $\mathcal{J}_{\text{relevance}}$ and $\mathcal{J}_{\text{ranking}}$;
  Compute gradients according to Eq. (17), Eq. (18) and Eq. (19);
  Fix Θ, W_N, W_V;
    Update Γ by Eq. (7);
  Backward propagation for Θ, W_N, W_V;
  Fix Θ, Γ
    Update W_N, W_V by Eq. (18) and Eq. (19);
  Fix W_N, W_V, Γ
    Update Θ by Eq. (17);
end for;
Return Θ;

4. Experiments

In this section, we evaluate the proposed CDL on the most challenge CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 face database [14], CUHK Face Sketch (CUFS) [28], CUHK Face Sketch FERET (CUFSF) [36] and IIIT-D Sketch Database [1]. First, we introduce the database and protocols. Second, the details of training methodology are presented. Then we perform the algorithmic analysis and compare our method with other state-of-the-art heterogeneous face recognition methods.



(a) intra-class variance (b) inter-class variance (c) Rank-1 error samples

Figure 2. The performance analysis of CDL. (a) and (b) shows the variations of intra-class and inter-class distance respectively. The x-axis indicates the dimension of features by PCA and the y-axis indicates intra-class and inter-class variances respectively. (c) shows the incorrectly matching results between probe (NIR images) and Gallery (VIS images) in the CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 database. The red box of a gallery image means the same identity of the probe image under cosine similarity.

4.1. Dataset and Protocol

The CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 face database is widely used to evaluate heterogeneous face recognition algorithms. Its challenge contains large variations of the same identity, expression, pose and distance. The database collects 725 subjects, each with 1-22 VIS and 5-50 NIR images and all the images are randomly gathered, therefore, there are not one-to-one correlations between NIR and VIS images. There are two views of evaluation protocols for the database. View 1 is used for super-parameters adjustment, and View 2 is used for training and testing. For a fair comparison with other methods, we choose the standard protocol in View 2. There are 10-fold experiments in View 2. Each fold contains training and testing lists. Nearly equal numbers of identities are included in the training and testing sets. For each fold, there are about 6,100 NIR images and 2,500 VIS images from about 360 identities. These subjects are exclusive from the 358 identities in the testing set. For the testing of each fold, the gallery contains 358 identities and each identity has one VIS image. The probe has over 6,000 NIR images from the same 358 identity. All the NIR images in the probe set compare against the gallery set and the evaluations are performed on verification rate(VR)@false acceptance rate(FAR) and rank-1 accuracy.

The IIIT-D Sketch database, the CUHK Face Sketch (CUFS), and the CUHK Face Sketch FERET (CUFSF) are all the viewed sketch-photo face database. the IIIT-D Sketch database comprises a total of 238 sketch-photo image pairs. The sketches are drawn by a professional sketch artist for digital images collected from different sources which consist of 67 pairs from the FG-NET aging database, 99 pairs from Labeled Faces in Wild (LFW) database, and 72 pairs from the IIIT-D student & staff database. The CUFS contains 306 persons totally 712 face images for training and 300 persons totally 600 face images for testing. Besides, on CUFSF, there are 500 persons for training and 694 persons for testing. Due to the few number of images in CUFS and the IIIT-D Sketch database, we use CUFSF as the training dataset and then the rank-1 accuracy for probe-gallery face identification testing is used for them. For the CUFSF, we follow its training and testing protocols to evaluate the proposed CDL methods.

4.2. Training Methodology

First, we train the basic light CNN on the MS-Celeb-1M dataset. All the training face images are converted to gray-scale and normalized to 144×144 according to five facial landmarks [30]. Then we crop an input image into 128×128 randomly and mirror it to enrich the number of training data. The momentum is set to 0.9 and the weight decay is set to 5e-4. Moreover, the drop ratio for the fully connected layer is set to 0.7. The learning rate is set to 1e-3 initially and reduced to 5e-5 gradually and we initialize the convolution parameters by Xavier and the fully-connected layers by Gaussian, respectively. The model is trained on TITAN X for two weeks and the performance on LFW obtains **98.80%**.

Based on the basic VIS network, we implement CDL on the heterogeneous face recognition database. CDL is initialized by the pre-trained basic model. For network training, the input images are also normalized to 144×144 and randomly cropped to 128×128, which is the same as the basic network. The batch size is set to 128 and the learning rate is decreased from 1e-4 to 1e-6 gradually for around 200,000 iterations. The trade-off parameter λ_1 for softmax term is set to 1 and λ_2 for cross modal ranking term is increased from 0 to 1 gradually. Moreover, the constant λ for relevance constraint in softmax is set to 0.001.

Table 1. Rank-1 accuracy (± standard variation) and verification rate(VR)@false accept rate(FAR) (± standard variation) of CDL with different supervised terms for the CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 database.

Supervised term	Rank-1 accuracy(%)	VR@FAR=0.1%(%)	VR@FAR=0.01%(%)
Basic model	91.88±0.58	85.31±0.95	63.52±3.14
Softmax	97.15±0.66	93.66±1.74	80.76±5.29
Relevance Constraint	97.31±0.60	94.57±1.51	82.96±4.80
Cross Modal Ranking	97.16±0.36	93.23±1.05	78.93±4.11
Softmax + Maximum Mean Discrepancy	95.31±0.80	93.57±0.61	75.62±2.80
Softmax + Central Moment Discrepancy	95.93±0.53	94.07±0.53	78.26±2.68
Softmax + Cross Modal Ranking	98.29±0.42	97.11±0.33	91.03±0.96
CDL	**98.62±0.20**	**98.32±0.05**	**93.24±0.66**

4.3. Algorithmic Analysis

The aim of the proposed CDL is to remove the gap between different spectral domains and find the intrinsic properties of the same identity. In this subsection, we investigate the interactions of softmax, relevance constraint and cross modal ranking on the CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 database.

To analyze the performance of each supervised term for CDL, we introduce the concept of linear discriminant analysis (LDA) from the view of inter-class and intra-class variations. According to LDA, the intra-class variance and inter-class can be denoted as

$$\sigma_{\text{intra}} = \frac{1}{c}\sum_{i=1}^{c}\frac{1}{N_i}\sum_{x\in X_i}(x-\bar{x_i})^T(x-\bar{x_i}) \qquad (20)$$

$$\sigma_{\text{inter}} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{c}(\bar{x_i}-\bar{x})^T(\bar{x_i}-\bar{x}) \qquad (21)$$

where X_i is the set of features of the i-th identity, c is the number of classes, N and N_i are the number of all the samples and ones of the i-th identity respectively, $\bar{x_i}$ is the corresponding mean and $\bar{x}$ is the mean of the entire dataset.

When only the softmax term is used, we find there are both diverse inter-class and intra-class variations for the learned embedding, as shown by the purple curves in Fig. 2. Although the inter-class variations help to distinguish different identities, the large diversity of intra-class variations introduce noise, especially for the cross modal matching. When there is only cross modal ranking as the supervised signal, as shown by the orange curve, we find that both inter-class and intra-class variance tend to decrease, since only cross modal ranking can hardly enforce a large-span feature embedding space. Besides, with the low inter-class variation, it is difficult to distinguish different identities.

As is shown in Fig. 2(a) and Fig. 2(b), the yellow curve indicates the inter-class and intra-class variance by only using the relevance constraint on softmax. Obviously, it can not only decrease the intra-class variation , but also reserve the inter-class variation. It shows that the low-rank relevance constraint in Eq. (2) can enforce the correlation between different modal samples. Furthermore, combined relevance constraint and cross modal ranking term with appropriate trade-off parameters($\lambda_1 = 1, \lambda_2 = 1$ and $\lambda = 0.001$),



Figure 3. ROC curves of different methods on the CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 database.

the intra-class variance decreases in both diversity and magnitude(see by the blue curve in Fig. 2(a) and Fig. 2(b)). At the same time, the inter-class variation keeps nearly unchanged. Obviously, the relevance constraint and cross modal ranking contribute to reducing the gap between different modal domains, while the softmax term can reserve the diversity of different identities instead.

Fig. 2(c) gives an overview of some failure cases for NIR-VIS matching. Obviously, the matching error is caused by the large pose and emotion variations. Since there are not enough NIR face images including different pose and emotions in the training dataset, CDL can not adopt these variations for NIR-VIS face matching.

In Table 1, two performance measures are reported for comparison, including rank-1 accuracy and verification rate(VR)@false acceptance rate(FAR). Firstly, comparing with performance of softmax and relevance constraint supervisory, the latter improves VR@FAR=0.1% and VR@FAR=0.01% by 0.91% and 2.20%, respectively. It suggests that the usage of the low-rank relevance constraint is effective. And then, the performance of cross modal ranking is lower than that of softmax on VR@FAR=0.1%(93.23% vs 93.66%) and VR@FAR=0.01%(78.93% vs 80.76%). These results show that only using the cross modal ranking signal can not ensure large inter-class variations. As mentioned above, we observe that the rank-1 accuracy, VR@FAR=0.1% and

Table 2. The comparison of Rank-1 accuracy (± standard variation) and VR@FAR=0.1% (± standard variation) on the CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 database.

Method	Rank-1 accuracy(%)	VR@FAR=0.1%(%)	Dimension
CDFL [9]	71.50±1.40	55.10	1000
Gabor+Remove 20 PCs [32]	75.54±0.75	71.40±1.21	-
Gabor+RBM+Remove 11PCs [32]	86.16±0.98	81.29±1.82	$80 \times 176 = 14080$
NIR-VIS reconstruction+UDP [10]	78.46±1.67	85.80	$32 \times 32 = 1024$
IDR-128 [7]	97.33±0.43	95.73±0.73	128
VGG [20]	62.09±1.88	39.72±2.85	4096
SeetaFace [18]	68.03±1.66	58.75±2.26	2048
CenterLoss [29]	87.69±1.45	69.72±2.07	$2 \times 512 = 1024$
Lightened CNN [30]	91.88±0.58	85.31±0.95	256
CDL	**98.62±0.20**	**98.32±0.05**	256

VR@FAR=0.01% of CDL have been better than others.

Besides, we implement generic cross modal algorithms such as Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) [5] and Central Moment Discrepancy (CMD) [35] shown in Table 1. It is obvious that CDL outperforms MMD and CMD, since MMD and CMD only consider the differences between modalities rather than the properties of each identities, which are also important for heterogeneous face recognition.

4.4. Method Comparison

We compare the performance of CDL with other state-of-the-art NIR-VIS face recognition methods, including coupled discriminant feature learning (CDFL)[9], NIR-VIS reconstruction + UDP[10] and Gabor + RBM + Remove 11PCs[32] and five CNN-based methods such as VGG[20], SeetaFace[18], CenterLoss[29], Lightened CNN[30] and IDR[7].

Fig. 3 plots the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves of our CDL and its eight top competitors. For a better illustration, especially for a low FAR interval, we do not report other ROC curves if these curves are low and use semi-logarithmic coordinate to show the curves. Obviously, our CDL consistently outperforms Gabor+Remove 20 PCs[32], Gabor+RBM+Remove 11PCs[32], NIR-VIS reconstruction+UDP[10], IDR [7] and other general face recognition methods when FAR is lower than 1%. The CDL obtains around 75% at FAR=0.0001% while IDR [7] gets only 55% and others are even lower than 40%. These results further show that CDL can obtain the discriminative feature representation and correctly classify some difficult NIR-VIS pairs.

Table 2 shows the rank-1 accuracy and VR@FAR=0.1% of state-of-the-art methods. Our CDL improves the best rank-1 accuracy from 97.33% to 98.62% compared with IDR. Besides, VR@FAR=0.1% has also significantly improved from 95.73% to 98.32%, suggesting that CDL can obtain more discriminative features than its competitors. All of these results demonstrate that the proposed CDL is effective for heterogeneous face recognition, and can learn a compact and modality invariant feature representation.

Table 3. The comparison of rank-1 and VR@FAR=1% for the IIIT-D Sketch Database.

Method	Rank-1(%)	FAR=1%(%)
Original WLD [1]	74.34	-
SIFT [1]	76.28	-
EUCLBP [1]	79.36	-
LFDA [1]	81.43	-
MCWLD [1]	84.24	-
VGG [20]	80.89	72.08
CenterLoss [29]	84.07	76.20
Lightened CNN [30]	84.07	75.30
CDL	**85.35**	**82.52**

We also compare CDL with other open source CNN face recognition solutions including VGG[20], SeetaFace[18], Lightened CNN[30] and CenterLoss[29]. CDL archives the highest performance on rank-1 accuracy (98.62% vs 91.88%) and VR@FAR=0.1% (98.32% vs 85.31%) as shown in Table 2. Obviously, simply applying CNN to heterogeneous face recognition is not effective.

We also evaluate CDL on the viewed sketch-photo face recognition database. As is shown in Table 3, CDL obtains 85.35% rank-1 accuracy which outperforms other viewed sketch-photo methods on the IIIT-D Sketch Database. Note that we employ CUFSF as the training dataset on different CNN-based methods. Table 3 shows the performance of VGG, CenterLoss, Lightened CNN and CDL on the IIIT-D Sketch Database. It is obvious that the proposed CDL is better than other CNN-based methods on a small number of training samples. Besides, if there are more sketch-photo images (not only two images in each identities), the performance of CDL will be further improved.

Moreover, we also perform CDL on CUFS and CUFSF, and we obtain 99.47% for rank-1 accuracy on CUFS and 99.91% for VR@FAR=0.1% on CUFSF, which outperform state-of-the-art 96.30% [28] on CUFS and 98.70% [36] on CUFSF, respectively.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we propose a coupled deep learning (CDL) framework for heterogeneous face recognition by introduc-

ing low-rank relevance constraint and cross modal ranking into CNN. CDL is an effective way for the limited number of training samples. The low rank constraint is utilized to increase the correlation between two modalities as the supervised signal and the cross modal ranking has been used to further improve the discrimination of CDL. Moreover, an alternating iterative optimization method has been developed for back-propagation to optimize an end-to-end CNN. Experimental results on the challenging CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 face recognition database and viewed sketch-photo databases show that our CDL significantly outperforms other state-of-the-art heterogeneous face recognition methods.

References

[1] H. S. Bhatt, S. Bharadwaj, R. Singh, and M. Vatsa. Memetic approach for matching sketches with digital face images. Technical report, IIITD-TR-2011-006, 2012.

[2] T. I. Dhamecha, P. Sharma, R. Singh, and M. Vatsa. On effectiveness of histogram of oriented gradient features for visible to near infrared face matching. In *ICPR*, 2014.

[3] D. Goswami, C. H. Chan, D. Windridge, and J. Kittler. Evaluation of face recognition system in heterogeneous environments (visible vs nir). In *ICCVW*, 2011.

[4] E. Grave, G. Obozinski, and F. R. Bach. Trace lasso: a trace norm regularization for correlated designs. In *NIPS*, 2011.

[5] A. Gretton, K. M. Borgwardt, M. J. Rasch, B. Schölkopf, and A. Smola. A kernel two-sample test. *JMLR*, 13(3):723–773, 2012.

[6] Y. Guo, L. Zhang, Y. Hu, X. He, and J. Gao. Ms-celeb-1m: A dataset and benchmark for large-scale face recognition. In *ECCV*, 2016.

[7] R. He, X. Wu, Z. Sun, and T. Tan. Learning invariant deep representation for nir-vis face recognition. In *AAAI*, 2017.

[8] C.-A. Hou, M.-C. Yang, and Y.-C. F. Wang. Domain adaptive self-taught learning for heterogeneous face recognition. In *ICPR*, 2014.

[9] Y. Jin, J. Lu, and Q. Ruan. Coupled discriminative feature learning for heterogeneous face recognition. *IEEE TIFS*, 10(3):640–652, 2015.

[10] F. Juefei-Xu, D. K. Pal, and M. Savvides. NIR-VIS heterogeneous face recognition via cross-spectral joint dictionary learning and reconstruction. In *CVPRW*, 2015.

[11] M. Kan, S. Shan, and X. Chen. Multi-view deep network for cross-view classification. In *CVPR*, 2016.

[12] B. Klare and A. K. Jain. Heterogeneous face recognition: Matching nir to visible light images. In *ICPR*, 2010.

[13] Z. Lei, Q. Bai, R. He, and S. Z. Li. Face shape recovery from a single image using cca mapping between tensor spaces. In *CVPR*, 2008.

[14] S. Z. Li, D. Yi, Z. Lei, and S. Liao. The CASIA NIR-VIS 2.0 face database. In *CVPRW*, 2013.

[15] S. Liao, D. Yi, Z. Lei, R. Qin, and S. Z. Li. Heterogeneous face recognition from local structures of normalized appearance. In *ICB*, 2009.

[16] D. Lin and X. Tang. Inter-modality face recognition. In *ECCV*, 2006.

[17] Q. Liu, X. Tang, H. Jin, H. Lu, and S. Ma. A nonlinear approach for face sketch synthesis and recognition. In *CVPR*, volume 1, 2005.

[18] X. Liu, M. Kan, W. Wu, S. Shan, and X. Chen. VIPLFaceNet: An open source deep face recognition sdk. *Frontiers of Computer Science*, 2016.

[19] J. Ngiam, A. Khosla, M. Kim, J. Nam, H. Lee, and A. Y. Ng. Multimodal deep learning. In *ICML*, 2011.

[20] O. M. Parkhi, A. Vedaldi, and A. Zisserman. Deep face recognition. *BMVC*, 2015.

[21] F. Schroff, D. Kalenichenko, and J. Philbin. Facenet: A unified embedding for face recognition and clustering. In *CVPR*, 2015.

[22] D. A. Socolinsky and A. Selinger. A comparative analysis of face recognition performance with visible and thermal infrared imagery. Technical report, DTIC Document, 2002.

[23] D. A. Socolinsky, A. Selinger, and J. D. Neuheisel. Face recognition with visible and thermal infrared imagery. *CVIU*, 91(1):72–114, 2003.

[24] Y. Sun, Y. Chen, X. Wang, and X. Tang. Deep learning face representation by joint identification-verification. In *NIPS*, 2014.

[25] X. Tang and X. Wang. Face sketch recognition. *TCSVT*, 14(1), 2004.

[26] K. Wang, R. He, W. Wang, L. Wang, and T. Tan. Learning coupled feature spaces for cross-modal matching. In *ICCV*, 2013.

[27] W. Wang, R. Arora, K. Livescu, and J. A. Bilmes. On deep multi-view representation learning. In *ICML*, 2015.

[28] X. Wang and X. Tang. Face photo-sketch synthesis and recognition. *IEEE TPAMI*, 31(11):1955–1967, 2009.

[29] Y. Wen, K. Zhang, Z. Li, and Y. Qiao. A discriminative feature learning approach for deep face recognition. In *ECCV*, 2016.

[30] X. Wu, R. He, Z. Sun, and T. Tan. A light cnn for deep face representation with noisy labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.02683*, 2016.

[31] F. Yan and K. Mikolajczyk. Deep correlation for matching images and text. In *CVPR*, 2015.

[32] D. Yi, Z. Lei, and S. Z. Li. Shared representation learning for heterogenous face recognition. In *FG*, 2015.

[33] D. Yi, S. Liao, Z. Lei, J. Sang, and S. Z. Li. Partial face matching between near infrared and visual images in mbgc portal challenge. In *ICB*, 2009.

[34] D. Yi, R. Liu, R. Chu, Z. Lei, and S. Z. Li. Face matching between near infrared and visible light images. In *ICB*, 2007.

[35] W. Zellinger, T. Grubinger, E. Lughofer, T. Natschläger, and S. Saminger-Platz. Central moment discrepancy (CMD) for domain-invariant representation learning. In *ICLR Workshop*, 2017.

[36] W. Zhang, X. Wang, and X. Tang. Coupled information-theoretic encoding for face photo-sketch recognition. In *CVPR*, 2011.

[37] J.-Y. Zhu, W.-S. Zheng, J.-H. Lai, and S. Z. Li. Matching nir face to vis face using transduction. *IEEE TIFS*, 9(3), 2014.